UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/502,464	07/26/2004	Carmen V. Sciortino Jr	US 1396/04 (VA)	4010

7590 04/20/2007

Law Office Dinesh Agarwal
Suite 330
5350 Shawnee Road
Alexandria, VA 22312

EXAMINER	
GANGLE, BRIAN J	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1645	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/502,464	SCIORTINO JR, CARMEN V.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian J. Gangle	1645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 January 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-7,9,10,12-16 and 18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1,2,4-7,9,10,12 and 13* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *14-16, 18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendment and remarks filed 1/16/2007 are acknowledged. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, 12-16, and 18 are pending. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, and 12-13 have been withdrawn as being drawn to non-elected inventions. Claims 14-16 and 18 are currently under examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

As per applicant's request, initialed copies of pages 2 and 5 of the information disclosure statement filed on 4/28/2006 are enclosed. The reference from Commonwealth Biotechnologies, as well as WO documents WO00/52203/A2/A3, and WO01/02577 A1 have been considered.

Objections Maintained

The objection to the specification for the use of trademarks is maintained.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Applicant's amendments to paragraphs 0031, 0040, and 0043 are noted; however, trademarks should be capitalized wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Further, it should be noted that the cited occurrences of improper use are only exemplary and applicant should review the specification to correct any other use of trademarks (See for example, the use of Triton X-100 in paragraph 0043).

Claim Rejections Withdrawn

The rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ansorg *et al.* (J. Clin. Microbiol., 20:84-88, 1984), is withdrawn in light of applicant's amendment thereto.

Claim Rejections Maintained

35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 14-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 17 in the office action mailed 7/17/2006.

The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant argues:

1. That monoclonal antibody PS2 will be deposited under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, upon allowance of the claims.

2. That monoclonal antibody PS2 was purchased commercially and is reported as one which recognizes lipoprotein I of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa.*

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and deemed non-persuasive.

Regarding argument 1, the examiner acknowledges applicant's intention to deposit said antibodies. However, it is noted that merely depositing antibodies is not sufficient to enable the invention; deposited material must be capable of self replication. Therefore, hybridomas that produce a particular monoclonal antibody would be needed to perfect a deposit of said antibody. Further, an acceptable deposit must be made under 37 CFR 1.801-1.809, in particular the averments concerning the term and condition of deposit. In this case, there is no evidence in the record that the inventor is in a position to make such an assertion as they do not own the material. Such a statement can only be made by a person in position to make that statement, that is, the assignee, inventor, corporate office or others so empowered.

As outlined previously, the rejected claims are drawn to kits containing, in part, monoclonal antibody PS2, an antibody specific for a lipoprotein of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa.*

The designation of PS2 constitutes a laboratory designation that does not provide any structural or functional limitation, nor does it provide a description of such an antibody.

The claims are drawn to a genus of antibodies, designated PS2, which can bind lipoprotein I of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. To fulfill the written description requirements set forth under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, the specification must describe at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus, or alternatively describe a representative member of the claimed genus, which shares a particularly defining feature common to at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus, which would enable the skilled artisan to immediately recognize and distinguish its members from others, so as to reasonably convey to the skilled artisan that Applicant has possession the claimed invention. To adequately describe the genus of antibodies which can bind lipoprotein I of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, Applicant must adequately describe the antigenic determinants (immunoepitopes) to which said antibodies would bind.

The specification, however, does not disclose distinguishing and identifying features of a representative number of members of the genus of antibodies to which the claims are drawn, so that the skilled artisan could immediately envision, or recognize at least a substantial number of members of the claimed genus of antibodies. Moreover, the specification fails to disclose which amino acid residues are essential to the function of the immunoepitope or which amino acids might be replaced so that the resultant immunoepitope retains the activity of its parent, or by which other amino acids the essential amino acids might be replaced so that the resultant immunoepitope retains the activity of its parent. Therefore, since the specification fails to adequately describe at least a substantial number of members of the genus of antibodies to which the claims are based; the specification fails to adequately describe at least a substantial number of members of the claimed genus of antibodies which can bind lipoprotein I of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.

MPEP § 2163.02 states, "[a]n objective standard for determining compliance with the written description requirement is, 'does the description clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that he or she invented what is claimed' ". The courts have decided:

The purpose of the "written description" requirement is broader than to merely

> explain how to "make and use"; the applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession *of the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the "written description" inquiry, *whatever is now claimed.*

See *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Federal Circuit, 1991). Furthermore, the written description provision of 35 USC § 112 is severable from its enablement provision; and adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

The Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 1, ``Written Description'' Requirement (66 FR 1099-1111, January 5, 2001) state, "[p]ossession may be shown in a variety of ways including description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing the invention was 'ready for patenting' such as by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete, or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention" (*Id.* at 1104). Moreover, because the claims encompass a genus of variant species, an adequate written description of the claimed invention must include sufficient description of at least a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. However, factual evidence of an actual reduction to practice has not been disclosed by Applicant in the specification; nor has Applicant shown the invention was "ready for patenting" by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete; nor has Applicant described distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant were in possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

The *Guidelines* further state, "[f]or inventions in an unpredictable art, adequate written description of a genus which embraces widely variant species *cannot* be achieved by disclosing only one species within the genus" (Id. at 1106); accordingly, it follows that an adequate written description of a genus cannot be achieved in the absence of a disclosure of at least one species

within the genus. As evidenced by Greenspan et al. (*Nature Biotechnology* 7: 936-937, 1999), defining epitopes is not as easy as it seems. Greenspan et al. recommends defining an epitope by the structural characterization of the molecular interface between the antigen and the antibody is necessary to define an "epitope" (page 937, column 2). According to Greenspan et al., an epitope will include residues that make contacts with a ligand, here the antibody, but are energetically neutral, or even destabilizing to binding. Furthermore, an epitope will not include any residue not contacted by the antibody, even though substitution of such a residue might profoundly affect binding. Accordingly, it follows that the immunoepitopes that can bind to a given antibody can only be identified empirically. Therefore, absent a detailed and particular description of a representative number, or at least a substantial number of the members of the genus of immunoepitopes, the skilled artisan could not immediately recognize or distinguish members of the claimed genus of antibodies which can bind lipoprotein I of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Therefore, because the art is unpredictable, in accordance with the *Guidelines*, the description of immunoepitopes (antigenic determinants) is not deemed representative of the genus of antibodies to which the claims refer. Hence, the claims do not meet the written description requirements. Further, as stated above, the designation of PS2 constitutes a laboratory designation that does not provide any structural or functional limitation, nor does it provide a description of such an antibody.

Claims 14-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention, for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 17 in the office action mailed 7/17/2006.

Applicant argues:

1. That monoclonal antibody PS2 will be deposited under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, upon allowance of the claims.

2. That monoclonal antibody PS2 was purchased commercially and is reported as one which recognizes lipoprotein I of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and deemed non-persuasive.

Regarding argument 1, the examiner acknowledges applicant's intention to deposit said antibodies. However, it is noted that merely depositing antibodies is not sufficient to enable the invention; deposited material must be capable of self replication. Therefore, hybridomas that produce a particular monoclonal antibody would be needed to perfect a deposit of said antibody. Further, an acceptable deposit must be made under 37 CFR 1.801-1.809, in particular the averments concerning the term and condition of deposit. In this case, there is no evidence in the record that the inventor is in a position to make such an assertion as they do not own the material. Such a statement can only be made by a person in position to make that statement, that is, the assignee, inventor, corporate office or others so empowered.

Regarding argument 2, merely recognizing that PS2 binds to lipoprotein I of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* does not provide the skilled artisan with the means to make and use the claimed antibodies. Regarding the commercial availability of PS2, although single source availability via commercial vendor can be used to enable an invention, there is no evidence that IMMR (the company cited by applicant as the place of purchase) is a commercial company or that said antibodies were or are available from any vendor.

As outlined previously, it is apparent that the monoclonal antibody designated PS2 is required in order to practice the invention. Specifically, it is noted that claim 17 recites deposited material. The deposit of biological material is considered by the Examiner to be necessary for the enablement of the current invention (see 37 CRF 1.808(a)).

If the deposit is made under terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by Applicants or person(s) associated with the patent owner (assignee) who is in a position to make such assurances, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature, stating that the deposit has been made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty *and* that all restrictions imposed by the depositor on the availability to the public of the deposited material will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent, would satisfy the deposit requirements. See 37 CFR 1.808.

If a deposit is not made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit, or declaration by Applicants or person(s) associated with the patent owner (assignee) who is in a position to make such assurances, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature, stating that the following criteria have been met:

1) during the pendency of the application, access to the deposit will be afforded to one determined by the Commissioner to be entitled thereto;

2) all restrictions imposed by the depositor on the availability to the public of the deposited material will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent; and

3) the deposits will be maintained for a term of at least thirty (30) years from the date of the deposit or for the enforceable life of the patent or for a period of at least five (5) years after the most recent request for the furnishing of a sample of the deposited material, whichever is longest; and

4) a viability statement in accordance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.807; and

5) the deposit will be replaced should it become necessary due to inviability, contamination or loss of capability to function in the manner described in the specification.

In addition, the identifying information set forth in 37 CRF 1.809(d) should be added to the specification. See 37 CFR 1.803 - 1.809 for additional explanation of these requirements.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 14-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 17 in the office action mailed 7/17/2006.

Applicant argues:

1. That monoclonal antibody PS2 will be deposited under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, upon allowance of the claims.

2. That monoclonal antibody PS2 was purchased commercially and is reported as one which recognizes lipoprotein I of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa.*

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and deemed non-persuasive.

As stated above, in the absence of evidence regarding the availability of PS2, the rejection stands.

As outlined previously, the claims are rendered vague and indefinite by the phrase "monoclonal antibody PS2." It is not clear what antibody applicant is referring to. The name "PS2" constitutes a laboratory designation that does not impart some functional or structural definition to the antibody.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The rejection of claims 14-16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ansorg *et al.* (J. Clin. Microbiol., 20:84-88, 1984) in view of Sciortino (Hybridoma, 12:327-332, 1993, IDS filed 7/23/2004), maintained for the reasons set forth in the previous office action.

Applicant argues:

1. That the present invention provides a rapid test that allows identification of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* on the first day of culture, and which is a single assay as opposed to a battery of tests required by conventional methods. Applicant goes on to state the sensitivity and specificity of the test.

2. That Ansorg *et al.* do not disclose or suggest the claimed kit for testing the presence of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Applicant points out that Ansorg *et al.* disclose a coagglutination test for *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* H antigens which are not the same as lipoprotein I.

3. That extraction of lipoprotein I is difficult and that no one in the art has yet been successful at both extraction of lipoprotein I and creating an assay for it. Applicant states "extraction of LPI renders it immunologically non-reactive without the ability to retain its immuno-reactive properties. The extraction and reaction buffers (reagents), as in the present invention, have a unique formulation that provides for extraction and further immuno-reaction with the PS2 monoclonal antibody."

4. That the examiner has noted that the present invention is in an unpredictable art, and that it has not been demonstrated that the test disclosed by Ansorg *et al.* would work for a completely different protein (lipoprotein I).

5. That the examiner's statement that it is standard to put necessary reagents together in a useful form is a hindsight reconstruction.

6. That it is not shown or explained why one would use the teachings of Ansorg *et al.*, absent the teachings of applicant's invention.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and deemed non-persuasive.

Regarding argument 1, none of the features mentioned (i.e. a rapid test that allows identification of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* on the first day of culture, and which is a single assay as opposed to a battery of tests required by conventional methods) are recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). If applicant's invention is a rapid test that allows identification of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* on the first day of culture, and which is a single assay as opposed to a battery of tests required by conventional methods, with a certain specificity and sensitivity, the claims should include these limitations. Further, if the components of the prior art are the same as those of the instant claims, the immunological properties would necessarily be the same.

Regarding argument 2, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the

rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Regarding argument 3, none of the features mentioned (i.e. extraction and reaction buffers with unique formulations that provide for extraction and further immunoreaction with the PS2 monoclonal antibody) are recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). All that is required by the claims regarding extraction reagents is the presence of *a* reagent for extracting the lipoprotein from *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. There is no limitation on what this reagent must be. Further, Sciortino *et al.* state that lipoprotein I can be separated from other membrane proteins by incubation in Triton® X-100 (see page 329, paragraphs 5-6). Therefore, Triton® X-100 is a reagent that meets this limitation of the claims.

Regarding argument 4, what is unpredictable is the molecular interface between a given antigen and a given antibody. Without knowing the immunoepitopes that can bind a given antibody, there is no way one would know which antibodies would bind to which antigen other than through empirical testing. In this instant case, Sciortino *et al.* disclose a monoclonal antibody called PS2 that binds to lipoprotein I of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Since this antigen-antibody pair has been identified empirically, the binding of these two molecules is not unpredictable. Moreover, agglutination testing has been in use since the 1950's and is a standard means of identifying a culture, it is hardly an unpredictable method. Ansorg *et al.* disclose a method of detecting the presence of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* antigens using agglutination testing. Merely changing the antibody (and thus the targeted molecule) does not render the method unpredictable or inoperable.

Regarding argument 5, In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Arranging the reagents needed for a

test in the form of a kit has been performed for many years. Further, applicant has not defined the term "kit." The dictionary definition of the word is "a set of articles used for a particular purpose" (Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary, 1988, page 667). Therefore, there is no structural requirement that the articles in a kit be arranged in some form. Merely having the articles needed constitutes a "set of articles" and therefore constitutes a kit.

Regarding argument 6, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Moreover, the reasons for combining Ansorg *et al.* and Sciortino *et al.* have been set forth previously, and are set forth again below.

As outlined previously, the instant claims are drawn to a kit for testing the presence of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in a sample, comprising: a) an agglutination reagent and b) an antibody specific for lipoprotein I of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, where the antibody is the monoclonal antibody PS2 (claim 14). Further limitations include the kit of claim 14, further comprising a reagent for extracting the lipoprotein from *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (claim 15); the kit of claim 15, wherein the agglutination reagent comprises a strain of *Staphylococcus* bacteria (claim 16); and the kit of claim 15, further comprising a negative control reagent (claim 18).

Ansorg *et al.* disclose a method of testing for the presence of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* using a coagglutination test (see abstract). Ansorg *et al.* disclose an agglutination reagent (*Staphylococcus aureus*), negative control reagent, and monoclonal antibodies specific for *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* H antigens (see page 84-85, methods section).

Ansorg *et al.* differs from the instant application in that the reagents required for the coagglutination test are not disclosed specifically as a kit. Ansorg *et al.* also differs from the instant application in that they do not disclose a reagent for extracting the lipoprotein from *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* or that the monoclonal antibody is PS2.

Sciortino discloses a monoclonal antibody called PS2 which is specific for lipoprotein I of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (see abstract). Sciortino further discloses that lipoprotein I can be separated from other membrane proteins by incubation in Triton® X-100 (see page 329,

paragraphs 5-6) and that lipoprotein I is unique and common to all *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and further confirms that lipoprotein I is ubiquitous in 99.4% of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* strains and is rarely found in other gram-negative bacteria.

Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the agglutination reagent (*Staphylococcus aureus*) and negative control reagent of Ansorg *et al.* with the monoclonal antibody PS2 and the reagent for extracting lipoprotein I of Sciortino into a kit, because it is standard to put necessary reagents together in a useful form for ease of use. One would have been motivated to include the monoclonal antibody PS2 and the extraction reagent because lipoprotein I (to which PS2 binds) is unique and common to all *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and extraction of lipoprotein I using Triton® X-100 separates and purifies the antigen.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Gangle whose telephone number is (571) 272-1181. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Siew can be reached on (571) 272-0787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian Gangle
AU 1645

ROBERT A. ZEMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER